REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to because the Detailed Description is allegedly void of any disclosure of an embodiment where the server has a shared view engine and the server receives from a host client a slave client identifier and a locator request to content on the server. However, in a telephone conversation on January 11, 2006, Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, noted, and the Examiner agreed, that such an embodiment is disclosed in the Detailed Description on at least Pg. 11, l. 29 – Pg. 12, l. 28. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the specification are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they allegedly fail to show the features of a server having a shared view engine and a server that receives from the host client a slave client identifier and a locator corresponding to content on the server. However, Applicants respectfully submit that a server 110a with a shared view engine 100s is shown in Fig. 2. Fig. 2 also shows a communications link 130 that is used to transmit data from a host client 120a to the shared view engine 100s on server 110a. Because the slave client identifier and the locator constitute data that is transmitted from the host client 120a to the shared view engine 100s on server 110a using link 130, Applicants respectfully submit that those features are also shown in Fig. 2.   Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Office Action alleges that the specification fails to provide a description of how a slave client can receive data from the

server that was not first requested by the slave client. However, Applicants respectfully submit that "server-push" technology, which enables clients to receive data from a server without first requesting the data, was well known in the art on May 21, 1999 (the filing date of the 09/316,822 application to which the present application claims priority). Applicants have attached a reference (Jeffrey Veen, The Big Push for Passive Viewing, September 9, 1996), submitted along with a supplemental IDS, which describes server-push technology in detail. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: <u>February 6, 2006</u>

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439